

By G. Jackson. June 6, 1962

Approved For Release 2000/04/18 : CIA-RDP84-00022R000200020004-7

File - containing

NOTES ON THESE PAPERS

25X1A

some considerations of
Organizational defects...
etc

Prepared by the
Western Europe Branch

1. It seem pretty clear to me that this is the origin of the "Global Survey" reorganization. At least, the reorganization followed pretty much these lines with a few exceptions such as that there was never any "Special Assistant." Apparently, someone was impressed with the power of WE's complaints and decided the Branch was right.

- with it,
copies of

25X1A April 17, 1949

April 21, 1949

25X1A

2. I doubt very much if [redacted] ever saw (or has ever seen) these papers. If he had, there would certainly have been a rebuttal. I wonder if persons concerned were not a little afraid to face what that rebuttal would have contained.

3. It is quite evident from these papers that (a) the WE people were mad clear through - their feelings had been bitterly hurt - and that they were organizing a conspiracy against an enemy; (b) that this ^(hatred) was the real basis of their attack and the reason for so much argumentum ad hominem and petitio principii; and (c) that far more real than the alleged mutilation of their "expert" intelligence is the morale problem (which in turn may have been what really impressed those who adopted the new plan.)

4. Aside from the obvious need of a reviewing authority, the basic fallacy in the argument arises from the fact that their "experts" were neither experts nor the persons of learning and judgment they are made out to be. I can only illustrate. The Italian

"expert" mentioned as having been overridden by [redacted] in the 25X1A

[redacted]

[redacted]

At

004-7
000022

-2-

judgment regarding intelligence estimates than your neighbor's pet
cat. The sort of thing that [REDACTED] 25X1C for publica-

tion was superficial, nonsense for the most part which no self-
respecting intelligence agency could think of forwarding to, say,
the Secretary of State. [REDACTED] 25X1A endeavors had, as WE avows, passed

through the hands of the Branch Chief [REDACTED] 25X1A and the editor

[REDACTED] 25X1A both of whom had had much experience in their fields
as stated. Yet [REDACTED] 25X1A whatever he might have done as editor for the

Navy during the war - was useless as an editor in ORE as events
proved (even [REDACTED] got rid of him in that capacity), and [REDACTED] 25X1A proved
time and again that he could not perceive good from bad in his
experts' work. Despite WE's allegations about how right it had
been in the matter [REDACTED] 25X1C WE was reasoning that,

because of the patriarchial nature of French and Italian family
life, the only kind of government that suited either country was
dictatorship. Hence, [REDACTED] 25X1C would win in Italy and DeGaulle in

France. [REDACTED] 25X1A was, of course, a flash in the pan, and DeGaulle
still glowers at the French. I wish a copy of [REDACTED] 25X1A papers ex-
isted. Then you could see what [REDACTED] was dealing with.

5. WE implies that [REDACTED] 25X1A was utterly ignorant and incom-
petent when all they are really saying is that he was tactless.
(Note what is said about [REDACTED] 25X1A is a master of
tact).

6. To the historian, WE's ingornance of how the Intelligence
Staff came into being is laughable. I am not sure whether this was
really ignorance or deliberate twisting of the facts.

-3-

7. The morale problem was a real one. The actual question, though, was the right way to solve it. In fine, it amounted to this: each branch had hired people who were flattered (or flattered themselves) into thinking themselves the last word on all matters relating to their countries. They saw ORE sending current and other intelligence to the very highest quarters of the Government. To be the author of a piece so distributed was naturally looked on as an honor. Each analyst undoubtedly worked very hard indeed on, say, an article for the weekly and was naturally grieved if it was rejected or altered.* Hence the morale problem. In later years, all Branches had "inter-branch" dailies, weeklies, monthlies, maybe yearlies which circulated within ORE and to a few specialists outside. These consumed much time that could have been better used. Candid people in the Branches sometimes would admit that the real reason for these was to insure that each analyst could see something he had written in some kind of print. It seems to me that there might be other ways of making analysts happy besides printing bad copy lest they complain of being slighted.

8. WE's categorical statement that intelligence should go straight from the analyst to the consumer is very interesting to me and gives another reasons for believing that this paper was taken to higher authority behind [REDACTED] back. In public meeting

25X1A

*NOTE: You are undoubtedly familiar with the student who can't see why he didn't get an "A" on his paper because he worked very hard on it.

-4-

in ORE, I do not believe any Branch Chief would have admitted in so many words that this was his view. I might add my belief that one reason why the Branch Chiefs never got rid of the Intelligence Staff (they always had the same thing under different names) and why the vaunted IPB mentioned in this document came to naught was that in the last analysis, they would ~~have~~ not dared send their material forward without an intervening review. Although they did not realize quite how bad their product was, they would have been most loath to take full responsibility for it.

9. The NOTE scotch taped to cover of folder is post script to the big WE memorandum. It is significant that the Branch did not see fit to forward, with this note, exactly what [REDACTED] had written, with LIM's comments. Without such a submission, this NOTE becomes a mere piece of innuendo, with no chance of comparison, and 25X1A [REDACTED] as usual, quoted out of context. It is interesting in this connection to note how the Branch not only chose its own quotations but misinterpreted what it quoted, either unintentionally or maliciously. [REDACTED] said that since there was no hurry about 25X1A the paper (the events then predicted have still to come to pass) that the study be allowed to hang fire. For some reasons or other, WE took this to mean that Montague thought the paper out of date!

10. Somehow characteristic of this whole thing is the page setting forth WE's unsubstantiated opinion that "intelligence should pass directly from the experts who produce it to 'those who need to know'" under the heading "Discussion of Relevant Intelligence Theory"!

-5-

11. "...testy college professors correcting freshmen (note mis-
spelling characteristic of freshmen) compositions." This was
25X1A [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] tactlessness, but it is damn difficult, when you are receiv-
ing what amount to C- freshman compositions from people who are
supposed to be college graduates, not to be a little testy at times.
CIA should have invested money wisely by sending some of the "highly
competent men" concerned through a course in Freshman English.

12. Suggested title for chapter on this. ~~Subject~~ - "The Knife
in the Back."